arXiv:1612.03608v1 [stat.ME] 12 Dec 2016

Submitted to the Annals of Statistics

A ONE-WAY ANOVA TEST FOR FUNCTIONAL DATA WITH GRAPHICAL INTERPRETATION

By Tomáš Mrkvička

Faculty of Economics, University of South Bohemia, Czech Republic
AND

By Ute Hahn
University of Aarhus, Denmark
AND

By Mari Myllymäki
Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke), Finland

Abstract A new functional ANOVA test, with a graphical interpretation of the result, is presented. The test is an extension of the global envelope test introduced by Myllymäki et al. (2016, Global envelope tests for spatial processes, J. R. Statist. Soc. B, doi: 10.1111/rssb.12172). The graphical interpretation is realized by a global envelope which is drawn jointly for all samples of functions. If an average function, computed over a sample, is out of the given envelope, the null hypothesis is rejected with the predetermined significance level α.

The advantages of the proposed procedure are that it identifies the domains of the functions which are responsible for the potential rejection and that it immediately offers a post-hoc test by identifying the samples which are responsible for the potential rejection. All that is done at the exact significance level α.

The proposed procedures rely on discretization of the functions, therefore the procedures are also applicable in the multidimensional ANOVA problem.

1. Introduction. Functional data appear in a number of scientific fields, where the process of interest is continuously monitored. Those include e.g. monitoring of the share price, the temperature in a given location or monitoring of a body characteristic. A classical statistical problem is to decide, if there exist differences between the groups of functions (e.g. the control group and treatment group). This problem is usually solved by determining

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62H15; secondary 62G10
Keywords and phrases: Functional ANOVA, Groups comparison, Permutation test, Nonparametrical methods, Point processes, Rank envelope test

the differences among the mean group functions and then we deal with a one-way functional ANOVA problem.

The functional ANOVA problem, both one-way and more complex designs, was previously studied by many authors. For example Cuevas et al. (2004) introduced asymptotic version of the ANOVA F-test, Ramsay and Silverman (2006) described a bootstrap procedure based on pointwise F-tests, Abramovich and Angelini (2006) used wavelet smoothing techniques, and Ferraty et al. (2007) used dimension reduction approach. Further, Cuesta-Albertos and Febrero-Bande (2010) applied the F-test on several random univariate projections and bound the tests together through false discovery rate. There is also a possibility to transform the function into one number and use the classical ANOVA but such a procedure can be blind against some alternatives.

Also the nonparametric permutation procedures have been used to address this problem. Hahn (2012) used an one-dimensional integral deviation statistic to summarize the deviance between groups. Its distribution had been obtained by permuting of the functions. Nichols and Holmes (2001) concentrated either on certain pointwise statistics, such as the F-statistic, and found the distribution of its maxima by permutation, or on the size of the area restricted by some given threshold. Since these statistics need to satisfy the homogeneity across the functional domain, Pantazis et al. (2005) recommended to concentrate on the p-values which are implicitely homogeneous across the domain and find the distribution of its minima by permutation. This p-value and also F-statistic methods are able to identify the regions of rejections by identifying a threshold of the statistics of the interest.

However, none of the available methods is able to give an graphical interpretation of the test results in the original space of the functions which can help the user to understand what are the reasons of potential rejections, when or where the potential differences appear. Our new proposed methods are based on the global rank envelope introduced in Myllymäki et al. (2016) and thus they are able to give such a graphical interpretation. The proposed method is a Monte Carlo method, where the simulations are obtained by permuting the functions. In this work, we will concentrate on the one-way functional ANOVA problem only, because in such a case the proposed Monte Carlo tests reach exactly the desired significance level α.

In Section 2.1 we introduce two completely nonparametric methods for the one-way functional ANOVA problem. The correction for heteroscedasticity is also described. The graphical interpretation of the tests also brings immediate post-hoc test, i.e. the test which of the groups are different. The

interesting point is that this post-hoc comparison is done together with the ANOVA test, thus on the exact significance level α and thus no second comparison is needed to find which groups differ.

In Section 2.2 we describe the global rank envelope test applied on the pointwise F-tests. This test does not have its immediate post-hoc comparison but it can be more powerful due to its parametrical nature.

In Section 3, we perform a simulation study in order to compare powers of our graphical procedures with the powers of the procedures which are already available. We have chosen only such procedures which are available through the software R (R Core Team, 2016). All our proposed methods can be found in the R package GET, which is available at github (`https://github.com/myllym/GET`).

In Section 4, we apply our methods to year temperature curves data and we study which days of the year are significantly warmer nowadays than in recent years.

Finally, in section 5 we apply our methods to point pattern data. The data under study are three groups of point patterns and the aim is to decide if there are differences in the structure of the patterns in the different groups. In this case, the typical approach is to choose a one-dimensional summary function, which summarizes the structure, and compute it for each pattern. The summary function is typically a function of the one-dimensional distance. In the point patterns literature the group comparison is done either using functional ANOVA as in Aliy et al. (2013) or using a bootstrap procedure as in Diggle et al. (1991), Diggle et al. (2000) or Schladitz et al. (2003). Furthermore, Hahn (2012) proposed a pure permutation procedure to correct the inaccurate significance level of the bootstrap procedure. In these works univariate statistics summarizing the structure of the point patterns were used and permuted or bootstrapped. On the other hand in our approach whole summary functions will be analyzed.

2. Rank envelope functional ANOVA. The new proposed method is based on the rank envelope test, introduced for the goodness of fit testing by means of functional statistics in Myllymäki et al. (2016). Roughly speaking, it is a Monte Carlo test, where the observed function is compared with the simulated functions through the so-called extreme rank measure. The extreme rank measure is able to sort the functions from the most extreme functions to the most central functions. Consequently, the rank envelope test gives a p-interval and the $(1-\alpha)\%$ global envelope. This graphical envelope has an intuitive meaning: When the observed function is outside of this envelope in a point (the whole p-interval is below α), the H_0 hypoth-

esis is rejected with the significance level α. When the observed function is completely inside this envelope (the whole p-interval is above α), the H_0 hypothesis is not rejected with the significance level α. Since the ties in the extreme rank measure can appear, there exist an intermediate state, where the observed function touches the envelope but does not cross it. In this case, the final decision can instead be based on the extreme rank length measure and the corresponding p-value. The extreme rank length measure is just a refinement of the extreme rank measure which has the desired graphical interpretation. The test based on the extreme rank length measure has the exact p-value (exact here means that the test achives the desired significance level α). Clearly, due to the mentioned ties, it is necessary to perform the rank envelope test with many simulations. The recommendation of the authors is to use at least 2499 simulations for one observed function.

In order to apply the rank envelope test for an ANOVA design, it is necessary to apply the extension of the rank envelope test described in Mrkvička et al. (2016). This extension is the rank envelope test applied on several observed test functions at once. This extension is in fact a multiple testing procedure which combines the output from several separate tests. The output of this combined rank envelope test is the set of envelopes with the same interpretation as above. Also the extreme length p-value can be obtained. It is important to mention here that the graphical interpretion automatically identifies which of the tested functions are responsible for the potential rejection and also it identifies which parts of the functions are responsible for the rejection. This is very important for the interpretation of the result of the test. This combined rank envelope test works with a general observed test vector which is compared to the simulated counterparts. Thus the functions have to be discretized. The discretization can be done in whatever manner, because the rank test gives the same weight to every element of the test vector.

2.1. *One way group comparison with graphical interpretation.* Below we describe a new functional ANOVA procedure which is based on the combined rank envelope test. This test is directly able to identify which groups are different and which parts of the domain are responsible for the potential rejection. All that is done at the common and exact significance level α guaranteed by the rank envelope test.

Let us assume that we have J groups which contain $n_1, \dots, n_J$ functions and denote the functions by $T_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, J, j = 1, \dots, n_j$. Assume that there exists non? random functions $\mu(r)$ and $\mu_i(r)$ such that

$$T_{ij}(r) = \mu(r) + \mu_i(r) + e_{ij}(r), i = 1, \dots, J, j = 1, \dots, n_j,$$

where $e_{ij}(r)$ are i.i.d. sample from a distribution $G(r)$ for every r. The only condition which $G(r)$ has to satisfy is that it has mean zero and finite variance. Thus we are dealing with completely nonparametric comparison of groups of functions.

We want to test the hypothesis H_0:

$$H_0 : \mu_i(r) \equiv 0, i = 1, \dots, J.$$

This hypothesis can be clearly tested by the combined rank test, if the test vector of the combined rank test is taken to consist of the average of test functions in the first group followed by the average of test functions in the second group, etc. We can shortly write that

$$\mathbf{T} = (\overline{T}_1(\mathbf{r}), \overline{T}_2(\mathbf{r}), \dots, \overline{T}_J(\mathbf{r})),$$

where $\overline{T}_i(\mathbf{r}) = (\overline{T}_i(r_1), \dots, \overline{T}_i(r_K)$. Thus, the length of the test vector becomes $J \times K$, where K stands for the number of r values to which the functions are discretized. Clearly, the discretization in different groups have to be performed equally. The simulations, which are necessary for applying the rank test, are produced by permuting the test functions $T_{ij}(r)$.

The hypothesis H_0 is equivalent to the hypothesis

$$H_0' : \mu_i(r) - \mu_j(r) \equiv 0, i = 1, \dots, J-1, j = i, \dots, J.$$

This hypothesis corresponds to the post-hoc test done usually after the ANOVA test is significant. However, this hypothesis can be directly tested by the combined rank test, if the test vector is taken to consist of differences of the group averages of test functions. We can shortly write that

$$\mathbf{T}' = (\overline{T}_1(\mathbf{r}) - \overline{T}_2(\mathbf{r}), \overline{T}_1(\mathbf{r}) - \overline{T}_3(\mathbf{r}), \dots, \overline{T}_{J-1}(\mathbf{r}) - \overline{T}_J(\mathbf{r})).$$

Here the length of the test vector becomes $J(J-1)/2 \times K$.

Recall that both tests described above are done at one common significance level α, which means that it is not necessary to perform the ANOVA test prior to the post-hoc test. Instead it is possible to apply only the post-hoc test obtaining an answer about the overall ANOVA test and also about the differences of groups. Note that the two tests test the same hypothesis H_0 but the tests are not the same, they are sensitive to different departures from H_0.

2.1.1. *Correction for an unequal variances for testing H_0'.* The two above procedures can be applied if the variances are equal across the groups of

functions. To deal with different variances of group means of test functions in the different permutations, we rescale them to unit variance. Then the test vector becomes

(1)
$$\mathbf{T}_1' = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_1(r) - \overline{T_2}(r)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_1(r)) + \mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_2(r))}}, \ldots, \frac{\overline{T}_{J-1}(r) - \overline{T_J}(r)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_{J-1}(r)) + \mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_J(r))}} \right).$$

In practice, $\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_1(r))$ must be estimated for each r. For small samples, the sample variance estimator can have big variance, which may influence the procedure. The variance can be smoothed by applying moving average to the estimated variance with a chosen window size b and replacing the sample variance in (1) by its moving average analogue,

$$\mathbf{T}_2' = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_1(r) - \overline{T_2}(r)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{MA}_b(\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_1(r))) + \mathrm{MA}_b(\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_2(r)))}}, \ldots, \frac{\overline{T}_{J-1}(r) - \overline{T_J}(r)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{MA}_b(\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_{J-1}(r))) + \mathrm{MA}_b(\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_J(r)))}} \right).$$

2.1.2. *Correction for an unequal variances for testing H_0.* If many groups should be compared, the above test based on group differences will consist of many subtests and the power can be small. In such a case it is possible to return to the test of hypothesis H_0 which consists of fewer subtests. To account for unequal variances in this test it is possible to set the test vector of the rank test as:

$$\mathbf{T}_2 = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_1(r) - \overline{T}_{-1}(r)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{MA}_b(\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_1(r))) + \mathrm{MA}_b(\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_{-1}(r)))}}, \ldots, \frac{\overline{T}_J(r) - \overline{T}_{-J}(r)}{\sqrt{\mathrm{MA}_b(\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_J(r))) + \mathrm{MA}_b(\mathrm{Var}(\overline{T}_{-J}(r)))}} \right),$$

where $\overline{T}_{-i}$ denotes the average of all test functions without the test functions of the i-th group.

2.2. *Rank envelope F-test.* If the normality of the errors is satisfied one may want to apply an F-test together with the rank envelope test in order to achieve higher power. The rank test has to be one-sided here. The correction for unequal variances can be done here by choosing the corrected F-statistic.

In this case the test vector used in the rank test is

$$\mathbf{T}_3 = (F(r_1), F(r_2), \ldots, F(r_K)),$$

where $F(r_i)$ stands for the F-statistic. The simulations, which are necessary for applying the rank test, are produced again by permuting the test functions. Unfortunately this test is not able to detect which groups are different and therefore a post-hoc test would have to be applied.

2.3. *Comparison to other permutation methods.* The nonparametric permutation methods often used in the brain image statistics are similar to our proposed methods, therefore we would like to stress the differences. The single threshold test (Nichols and Holmes, 2001) of a certain statistic whose maximum is permuted is limited to the statistics that are homogeneous across the functional domain, in order to be sensitive in the whole functional domain and not only in the part of the domail where the functions are the most varying. The p-min permutation procedure used e.g. in Pantazis et al. (2005) solves this problem. This method can be viewed as the one-sided rank envelope test applied on set of pointwise permutation ANOVA p-values. The p-min permutation procedure use then the conservative p-value of the mentioned rank envelope test, e.g. the upper bound of the p-interval. On the other hand, our rank envelope test is equiped also with extreme rank length measure which solves the problems of ties in the p-min distribution. The p-min procedure is thus generally conservative, whereas the rank test has the exact type I error. Further, our rank test gives the graphical interpretation in the original space of functions and for each group of functions, whereas the p-min test gives it only in the transformed space of p-values and for all groups simultaneously. Therefore the p-min test is able only to identify the regions of rejection. The rank test is also equipped with the global envelope which informs the user much about the variability of the curves in the study. Finally, the rank test procedure is defined here also for combining several post-hoc tests together in one test and therefore it indicates which two groups are different and where they are different.

3. Simulation study. Our simulation study has similar design with the study performed in Cuevas et al. (2004), but we compare more functional ANOVA procedures together. We compared the asymptotic version of the F-test (AsF) introduced in Cuevas et al. (2004), random univariate projection method (RPM) introduced in Cuesta-Albertos and Febrero-Bande (2010), one-dimensional integral permutation test (IPT) introduced in Hahn (2012), F-max permutation procedure described in Nichols and Holmes (2001), p-min permutation procedure described in Pantazis et al. (2005) with our proposed methods. Our methods included in the study were the rank envelope comparison of means (RECM) where test vector $\mathbf{T}$ is used, the rank envelope comparison of means differences (RECMD) where test vector $\mathbf{T}'$ is used and the rank envelope F-test (REF).

An artificial example of $J = 3$ groups and $n = 10$ functions observed in the interval $[0, 1]$ through 100 evenly spread discrete points was studied. Four different models with two different autocorrelation error structures

were considered. The models were

- M1: $T_{ij}(r) = r(1-r) + e_{ij}(r), i = 1,2,3, j = 1,\ldots,10,$
- M2: $T_{ij}(r) = r^i(1-r)^{6-i} + e_{ij}(r), i = 1,2,3, j = 1,\ldots,10,$
- M3: $T_{ij}(r) = r^{i/5}(1-r)^{6-i/5} + e_{ij}(r), i = 1,2,3, j = 1,\ldots,10,$
- M4: $T_{ij}(r) = 1 + i/50 + e_{ij}(r), i = 1,2,3, j = 1,\ldots,10.$

The first autocorrelation structure of errors was the white noise, i.e. $e_{ij}(r_k), k = 1,\ldots,100$, were iid random variables with $N(0,\sigma)$. In the second structure, the errors $e_{ij}(r)$ were modeled by standard Brownian process with dispersion parameter σ. Each of the 8 different cases were treated for 7 different contaminations of the basic model given by 7 different standard deviations $\sigma_1 = 0.025, \sigma_2 = 0.05, \sigma_3 = 0.1, \sigma_4 = 0.15, \sigma_5 = 0.2, \sigma_6 = 0.4, \sigma_7 = 0.8$. Every standard deviation is twice the previous one, except σ_4 which is added in the middle of σ_3 and σ_5 in order to increase the sensitivity of the simulation study.

The model M1 corresponds to the situation where H_0 is true. Thus, in this case, the predetermined significance level is estimated. It was set to $\alpha = 0.05$ in all cases. The other models represent different situations where H_0 is false. The mean functions in model M2 and M3 have different shape, whereas the mean functions in model M4 are constant.

All the tested procedures were run using 2000 Monte Carlo replications or permutations, except for the p-min procedure which was run with 10000 simulations instead. The RPM was run with 30 random projections and the false discovery rate p-value computed out of these projections was used as a final output of this procedure. The extreme rank length p-value was used as the output of all rank envelope tests. Each of the cases were simulated 1000 times and the proportion of rejections were computed to obtain the estimates of significance levels and powers. All the results are summarized in Table 1 for the white noise cases and in Table 2 for the Brownian error cases.

The empirical significance level should be in the interval $(0.037, 0.064)$ with the probability 0.95 (given by the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles of the binomial distribution with parameters 1000 and 0.05). This is satisfied for most of the studied cases. The only exception is the AsF procedure in the case of the independent errors. This exception is caused by the high number of discretized points. For 20 discretized points the AsF test did not show this feature.

The estimated powers of our three procedures are significantly greater than the powers of AsF and RPM methods for all three studied models especially for the case of the Brownian errors. They are comparable to the

powers of p-min and F-max procedures, because they have similar nature. We remark here that we have used five times more simulations for the p-min procedure than for other procedures in order to reduce its conservativeness. Since the IPT procedure integrates all the deviations, it differs from our procedures a lot: for iid errors it is more powerful and, for Brownian errors less powerful. Surprisingly the powers of the REF method is not greater than the powers of the RECM and RECMD methods which are fully nonparametric (the errors are normally distributed).

4. Real case study - comparison of groups of temperature curves. As the first real case example we chose classical year temperature curves. We used the water temperature data sampled at the water level of Rimov reservoir in Czech republic every day for last 35 years. The water temperature data are naturally smoothed. We constructed three groups of year temperature curves in order to see if there are any changes in the year temperature courves. The first group was taken to consist of years 1979 till 1990, the second group of years 1991 till 2002 and the third group group of years 2003 till 2014. Figure 1 shows the temperature curves in the three groups.



FIGURE 1. *The temperature curves in the three groups.*

Figure 2 shows the comparison of the three groups of functions by means of **T**. Each subplot shows the comparison of a group with respect to variability of all groups. The result shows that only the third group deviates from the overall mean significantly and that this deviation is around 120th day of the year as can be seen on the bottom right panel in details. This result corresponds to the finding that the summer comes earlier in the last decade

than earlier. The 95% global envelopes demonstrate here the variability of the average curve in the original space of curves under the H_0 hypothesis. The test was performed with 50000 permutations.



FIGURE 2. *Rank envelope test for comparison of three groups of temperature curves. The subplots correspond to the comparison of the certain group average with respect to the variability in all groups. The right bottom subplot is a zoom to the only significant region seen in the third group. The grey areas represent the 95% global envelope.*

Figure 3 shows the result of the comparison of three groups of curves via difference of group averages when $\mathbf{T}'$ was used as test vector. Each subplot shows the comparison of 2 groups. The test statistic being negative corresponds to the situation that the second group temperature is higher than the first group temperature in the comparison. This test contains implicitely the post hoc comparison of groups.



FIGURE 3. *Rank envelope test for comparison of three groups of temperature curves via difference of group averages. The subplots correspond to the difference of the two group averages, the right bottom subplot is a zoom to the only significant region seen between the first and third groups. The grey areas represent the 95% global envelope.*

As an illustration of the rank envelope F-test we computed the one-sided rank test for the F-statistics. The resulted 95% simultaneous upper envelope can be seen in Figure 4 showing the days reponsible for the rejection, but this representation is not in the space of temperature curves as the two previous procedures.



FIGURE 4. *Rank envelope test for comparison of three groups of temperature curves via F-statistic of the ANOVA. Solid line corresponds to the data F-function, the upper dashed line is the 95% upper envelope, the lower dashed line is 0 corresponding to lower envelope and the dotted line corresponds to the average of F-functions from the permutations.*

5. Real case study - comparison of groups of point patterns. As second real case example we chose an example from point patterns statistics. The usual practice in point pattern literature is to represent a structure of the point pattern by a summary function which is a function of the distance r, usually the distance between two points in the pattern. Thus in fact each point pattern is replaced by one summary function and thus the comparison of groups of point patterns leads to the functional ANOVA problem.

To describe our approach we reanalyse the data of Diggle et al. (1991) containing three groups of pyramidal neurons in the cingulate cortex of humans, the normal - control group, schizoaffective group and schizophrenic group. One representative pattern from each group can be seen in Figure 5. Each point pattern is rescaled to the unit observing window. We discarded

the point patterns with less than 20 points prior to the analysis, which led to 12 point patterns in the normal group, 7 patterns in the schizoaffective group and 7 patterns in the schizophrenic group.



FIGURE 5. *One representative point pattern of each group of pyramidal neuron positions.*

As the summary function we chose the estimator of the centred L-function with the isotropic correction. Shortly, this function represents the number of neighboring points within the given distance compared with the expected number of neighbors in the case of complete spatial randomness. That is, if the centred L-function is positive for a given distance, it indicates attraction of points up to the , while negative values of the function indicate repulsion of points The details can be found e.g. in Illian et al. (2008). Figure 6 shows these estimated L-functions in the three groups.



FIGURE 6. *The estimated centred L-functions in the three groups.*

5.1. *Weighted average.* Since the point patterns have different numbers of points, the L-functions are estimated with different precisions. To take

into account these differences, it is possible to use weighted averages instead of basic averages as was proposed already in Diggle et al. (2000). Diggle et al. (2000) proposed weights which correspond to the number of points in the point pattern. In fact, the variance of the estimated L-function behaves approximately as $1/m_{ij}$, where m_{ij} is the number of points in the ij-th point pattern. Thus, such weighted average can decrease the group variability of L-functions and improve the procedure. Thus for point patterns, the weighted average is defined as

$$\overline{L}_i(r) = \sum_{j}^{n_i} \frac{m_{ij}}{m_i} L_{ij}(r),$$

where $m_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} m_{ij}$. The variance of weighted average,

$$\mathrm{var}(\overline{L}_i(r)) = \sum_{j}^{n_i} \frac{m_{ij}^2}{m_i^2} \mathrm{var}(L_{ij}(r)),$$

has to be then used in the $\mathbf{T}_2'$. The variance $\mathrm{Var}(L_{ij}(r))$ can be estimated as shown in Section 2.1.1.

5.2. *Test results.* Figure 7 shows the result of the comparison of the three groups of point patterns via difference of group weighted averages when $\mathbf{T}_2'$ was used as test vector. The test statistic $\mathbf{T}_2'$ was used in order to deal with unequal group variances of L-functions, which arises from the unequal mean numbers of points in the point patterns in different groups. The number of r-values was set to 500 for each L-function and the window size of the moving average was set to 75. Each subplot shows the comparison of 2 groups. The test statistic being positive corresponds to the situation that the first group is more clustered than the second group in the comparison. Our result shows no differences between groups similarly as in the originally study and as the rank envelope F-test shown in Figure 9.

Figure 8 further shows the comparison of the three groups by means of $\mathbf{T}_2$ with application of the weighted average. Each subplot shows the comparison of a group with respect to the rest of the groups. The test statistic being positive corresponds to the situation that the group is more clustered than the rest of groups. Our result again shows no differences between groups.

As an illustration of the rank envelope F-test we computed the one-sided rank test for the F-statistics from 2499 permutations for the neuron data.



FIGURE 7. *Rank envelope test for comparison of the three groups of L-functions via difference of group weighted averages using $s = 7500$ simulations. The left subplot corresponds to the difference between the first and second group, the middle subplot corresponds to the difference between the first and third group and the right subplot corresponds to the difference between the second and third group. The grey area represents the 95% global envelope.*



FIGURE 8. *Rank envelope test for comparison of the three groups of L-functions via difference of the averages of a group and the rest of the groups using $s = 7500$ simulations. The left, middle and right subplots correspond to the difference of the first, second and third groups with respect to the remaining groups, respectively. The grey area represents the 95% global envelope.*

The number of r-values was set to 500. The weighted ANOVA was performed in order to deal with unequal group variances of L-functions. The Kruskal-Wallis test with the χ^2-statistic could be applied instead.



FIGURE 9. *Rank envelope test for comparison of the three groups of L-functions via F-statistic of the weighted ANOVA using $s = 2499$ simulations. Solid line corresponds to the data F-function, the upper dashed line is the 95% upper envelope, the lower dashed line is 0 corresponding to lower envelope and the dotted line corresponds to the average of F-functions from the permutations.*

The resulted 95% global upper envelope can be seen in Figure 9 showing no rejection for any distances r.

From the first subplot of Figure 7, we can observe that the first and second group are rather similar. Therefore we joined the first and second group as was done in the original study. The result of the comparison of first and second group with third group is shown in Figure 10.

Also here we do not observe significant difference between the first and second group with respect to the third group at the significance level 0.05. Note that the original study reported a p-value of similar size, but Hahn



FIGURE 10. *Rank envelope test for comparison of the two groups of L-functions via difference of group averages using* $s = 2500$ *simulations. The plot corresponds to the difference between the joined first and second group, and the third group. The grey area represents the 95% global envelope.*

(2012) proved that the original method of Diggle et al. (2000) was liberal due to the permutation of functional residuals. On the other hand our method is exact because the original functions are permuted.

6. Discussion. New one-way functional ANOVA methods were introduced in this paper. The methods have exact type I error and they provide a graphical interpretation which is essential for the interpretation of the results. Also corrections for unequal variances were presented. Two different methods provide different graphical interpretation. The first method compares differences between every pair of groups similarly like a Tukey post-hoc test in the univariate ANOVA. The second method compares every group with the rest of the groups. A side effect of our methods is that the post-hoc test is provided together with the main ANOVA procedure at the given significance level. The third proposed method which is based on the F-test seems to have no advantages with respect to previous two proposed methods, according to our simulation study, therefore we do not recommend to use it.

Our new methods were compared to the other functional ANOVA procedures, available through the software R, with respect to their power. The permutation procedure were uniformly more powerful than asymptotic F-

test and random projection method in our study. Considering the permutation methods, none of the procedures was uniformly the most powerful one. The F-max and p-min procedures were very similar in power to our REF method (they are the the most similar methods). We remind again that p-min procedure was computed with five times more simulations in order to reduce its conservativeness. The integral based procedure IPT was very different in power than the others. For the iid case it was more powerful whereas for the Brownian case it was less powerful than our proposed methods. The opposite can be said about comparison of F-max and p-min with our proposed procedures. An important feature of all studied permutation methods is that these procedures do not loose their power when the functions are more densely discretized.

Importantly, our simulation study shows that there is no procedure which would be uniformly more powerful than our proposed procedures. Therefore, we believe that our procedures are useful in practice due to their graphical interpretation and post-hoc nature.

Our new procedures were designed for the one-way functional ANOVA design. A question of our future research is how these procedures can be extended into multi-way design. Since the permutation of the functional residuals leads to a liberal method, the problem has to be solved in a more complex way.

Acknowledgements. Mrkvička has been financially supported by the Grant Agency of Czech Republic (Project No. 16-03708S) and Mari Myllymäki by the Academy of Finland (project numbers 295100, 306875). Hahn's research has been supported by the Centre for Stochastic Geometry and Advanced Bioimaging, funded by the Villum Foundation.

References.

Abramovich, F. and C. Angelini (2006). Testing in mixed-effects {FANOVA} models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference 136*(12), 4326 – 4348.

Aliy, M., J. Seguin, A. Fischer, N. Mignet, L. Wendling, and T. Hurtut (2013). Comparison of the spatial organization in colorectal tumors using second-order statistics and functional anova. *Image and Signal Processing and Analysis (ISPA), 2013 8th International Symposium on*, 257–261.

Cuesta-Albertos, J. and M. Febrero-Bande (2010). A simple multiway anova for functional data. *Test 19*(3), 537–557.

Cuevas, A., M. Febrero, and R. Fraiman (2004). An anova test for functional data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 47*(1), 111 – 122.

Diggle, P. J., N. Lange, and F. M. Beneš (1991). Analysis of variance for replicated spatial point patterns in clinical neuroanatomy. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 86*, 618–625.

Diggle, P. J., J. Mateu, and H. E. Clough (2000). A comparison between parametric and

non-parametric approaches to the analysis of replicated spatial point patterns. *Advances in Applied Probability 32*, 331–343.

Ferraty, F., P. Vieu, and S. Viguier-Pla (2007). Factor-based comparison of groups of curves. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 51*(10), 4903 – 4910.

Hahn, U. (2012). A studentized permutation test for the comparison of spatial point patterns. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 107*(498), 754–764.

Illian, J., A. Penttinen, H. Stoyan, and D. Stoyan (2008). *Statistical Analysis and Modelling of Spatial Point Patterns* (1 ed.). Statistics in Practice. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Mrkvička, T., M. Myllymäki, and U. Hahn (2016). Multiple monte carlo testing, with applications in spatial point processes. *Statistics and Computing*, Doi: 10.1007/s11222–016–9683–9.

Myllymäki, M., T. Mrkvička, P. Grabarnik, H. Seijo, and U. Hahn (2016). Global envelope tests for spatial processes. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, Doi: 10.1111/rssb.12172.

Nichols, T. E. and E. Holmes (2001). Nonparametric permutation tests for functional neuroimaging: A primer with examples. *Human Brain M 15*, 1–25.

Pantazis, D., T. E. Nichols, S. Baillet, and R. M. Leahya (2005). A comparison of random field theory and permutation methods for the statistical analysis of meg data. *Neuroi 25*, 383–394.

R Core Team (2016). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Ramsay, J. and B. Silverman (2006). *Functional Data Analysis* (2 ed.). Springer Series in Statistics. Springer.

Schladitz, K., A. Särkkä, I. Pavenstädt, O. Haferkamp, and T. Mattfeldt (2003). Statistical analysis of intramembranous particles using freeze fracture specimens. *Journal of Microscopy 211*, 137–153.

Dpt. of Applied Mathematics and Informatics, Faculty of Economics, University of South Bohemia, Studentská 13, 37005 České Budějovice, Czech Republic E-mail: mrkvicka.toma@gmail.com
Centre for Stochastic Geometry and Advanced Bioimaging, Department of Mathematics, University of Aarhus, 8000

Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke), P.O. Box 2, FI-00791 Helsinki, Finland E-mail: mari.myllymaki@luke.fi

TABLE 1
The proportions of rejections (at level 0.05) over 1000 runs in the case of independent errors for models M1, M2, M3, M4.

M1	$\sigma_1 = 0.025$	$\sigma_2 = 0.05$	$\sigma_3 = 0.1$	$\sigma_4 = 0.15$	$\sigma_5 = 0.2$	$\sigma_6 = 0.4$	$\sigma_7 = 0.8$
AsF	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
RPM	0.072	0.065	0.074	0.052	0.052	0.071	0.062
IPT	0.055	0.061	0.064	0.068	0.055	0.065	0.051
F-max	0.041	0.060	0.054	0.043	0.050	0.061	0.057
p-min	0.041	0.062	0.051	0.055	0.048	0.056	0.054
RECM	0.048	0.058	0.046	0.065	0.053	0.051	0.046
RECMD	0.049	0.047	0.058	0.056	0.047	0.053	0.040
REF	0.045	0.058	0.046	0.057	0.061	0.055	0.055
M2	$\sigma_1 = 0.025$	$\sigma_2 = 0.05$	$\sigma_3 = 0.1$	$\sigma_4 = 0.15$	$\sigma_5 = 0.2$	$\sigma_6 = 0.4$	$\sigma_7 = 0.8$
AsF	1.000	0.999	0.038	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000
RPM	1.000	0.746	0.180	0.096	0.088	0.064	0.059
IPT	1.000	1.000	0.669	0.273	0.163	0.081	0.054
F-max	1.000	0.934	0.196	0.106	0.073	0.050	0.060
p-min	1.000	0.875	0.188	0.107	0.067	0.044	0.050
RECM	1.000	0.998	0.282	0.135	0.094	0.053	0.053
RECMD	1.000	0.994	0.260	0.152	0.082	0.062	0.058
REF	1.000	0.932	0.195	0.115	0.074	0.048	0.061
M3	$\sigma_1 = 0.025$	$\sigma_2 = 0.05$	$\sigma_3 = 0.1$	$\sigma_4 = 0.15$	$\sigma_5 = 0.2$	$\sigma_6 = 0.4$	$\sigma_7 = 0.8$
AsF	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.686	0.002	0.000
RPM	1.000	1.000	0.991	0.741	0.452	0.119	0.078
IPT	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.995	0.367	0.095
F-max	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.844	0.164	0.052
p-min	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.994	0.794	0.151	0.043
RECM	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.942	0.197	0.044
RECMD	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.953	0.183	0.066
REF	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.844	0.166	0.060
M4	$\sigma_1 = 0.025$	$\sigma_2 = 0.05$	$\sigma_3 = 0.1$	$\sigma_4 = 0.15$	$\sigma_5 = 0.2$	$\sigma_6 = 0.4$	$\sigma_7 = 0.8$
AsF	1.000	1.000	0.184	0.002	0.002	0.000	0.000
RPM	1.000	0.903	0.308	0.110	0.091	0.078	0.074
IPT	1.000	1.000	0.937	0.424	0.212	0.072	0.052
F-max	1.000	0.782	0.192	0.097	0.079	0.063	0.056
p-min	1.000	0.740	0.184	0.090	0.081	0.054	0.060
RECM	1.000	0.988	0.347	0.146	0.110	0.063	0.053
RECMD	1.000	0.987	0.350	0.138	0.098	0.067	0.055
REF	1.000	0.852	0.205	0.102	0.083	0.061	0.054

TABLE 2
The proportions of rejections (at level 0.05) over 1000 runs in the case of brownian errors for models M1, M2, M3, M4.

M1	$\sigma_1 = 0.025$	$\sigma_2 = 0.05$	$\sigma_3 = 0.1$	$\sigma_4 = 0.15$	$\sigma_5 = 0.2$	$\sigma_6 = 0.4$	$\sigma_7 = 0.8$
AsF	0.061	0.058	0.050	0.060	0.065	0.065	0.055
RPM	0.041	0.037	0.033	0.038	0.047	0.040	0.031
IPT	0.054	0.053	0.040	0.051	0.058	0.062	0.040
F-max	0.041	0.048	0.044	0.058	0.056	0.053	0.040
p-min	0.040	0.046	0.039	0.055	0.049	0.051	0.037
RECM	0.052	0.046	0.042	0.053	0.058	0.051	0.046
RECMD	0.048	0.047	0.045	0.052	0.055	0.062	0.039
REF	0.038	0.050	0.042	0.058	0.055	0.056	0.037
M2	$\sigma_1 = 0.025$	$\sigma_2 = 0.05$	$\sigma_3 = 0.1$	$\sigma_4 = 0.15$	$\sigma_5 = 0.2$	$\sigma_6 = 0.4$	$\sigma_7 = 0.8$
AsF	1.000	0.647	0.147	0.087	0.071	0.068	0.057
RPM	1.000	0.995	0.630	0.235	0.142	0.063	0.040
IPT	1.000	1.000	0.588	0.218	0.124	0.066	0.051
F-max	1.000	1.000	0.956	0.624	0.349	0.108	0.066
p-min	1.000	1.000	0.951	0.603	0.337	0.102	0.059
RECM	1.000	1.000	0.948	0.592	0.337	0.099	0.063
RECMD	1.000	1.000	0.940	0.565	0.328	0.108	0.062
REF	1.000	1.000	0.954	0.620	0.346	0.115	0.064
M3	$\sigma_1 = 0.025$	$\sigma_2 = 0.05$	$\sigma_3 = 0.1$	$\sigma_4 = 0.15$	$\sigma_5 = 0.2$	$\sigma_6 = 0.4$	$\sigma_7 = 0.8$
AsF	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.665	0.309	0.105	0.074
RPM	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.982	0.556	0.129
IPT	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.284
F-max	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
p-min	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
RECM	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999
RECMD	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
REF	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
M4	$\sigma_1 = 0.025$	$\sigma_2 = 0.05$	$\sigma_3 = 0.1$	$\sigma_4 = 0.15$	$\sigma_5 = 0.2$	$\sigma_6 = 0.4$	$\sigma_7 = 0.8$
AsF	1.000	0.759	0.229	0.140	0.103	0.071	0.052
RPM	1.000	0.927	0.278	0.123	0.087	0.049	0.039
IPT	1.000	1.000	0.565	0.249	0.135	0.060	0.045
F-max	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.987	0.813	0.189	0.076
p-min	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.983	0.783	0.177	0.072
RECM	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.913	0.605	0.133	0.070
RECMD	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.891	0.637	0.140	0.062
REF	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.982	0.796	0.181	0.076